

REMARKS

I. Introduction

The present response is intended to place the application in condition for allowance and is believed to overcome all outstanding rejections. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

By this response, Applicants have canceled claims 41, 61, 67-68, 82, and 176-187 and amended claims 1, 14-15, 25-26, 39, 42-43, 50-51, 60, 62-63, 69-72, 81, 83-84, 115-130, 132, 141-142, and 171-174. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-12, 14-18, 25-37, 39-40, 42-43, 50-58, 60, 62-63, 69-79, 81, 83-84, 88-92, 115-132, 141-142, and 171-174 are now pending in this application.

II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejected all of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). (See, the Office Action, pp. 4-19.) The amended claims overcome these rejections for reasons presented below.

a. Independent Claims 1, 26, 51, 72, 115, 124, 141-142, and 171-174

The Office Action rejected each of independent claims 1, 26, 51, 72, 115, 124, 141, 142, 171, 172, 173, and 174 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,178,243 to Pomerantz et al. ("Pomerantz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,900,005 to Saito et al. ("Saito"). (See, the Office Action, p. 4, section II.) The amended independent claims overcome these rejections for at least the following reasons.

As currently amended, each of the independent claims recites decrypting encrypted text within a patched operating system function. Support for this feature can be found in the original specification at, *e.g.*, paragraphs [0013]-[0016], [0060]-[0061], and [0075]-[0077].

Neither Pomerantz nor Saito discloses decrypting encrypted text within a patched operating system function. The Office Action concluded that Pomerantz discloses decrypting "[a] portion of encrypted text prior to displaying the page (col. 6, lines 28-34)." (See, the Office Action, p. 5, line 6.) However, Pomerantz does not disclose performing this decryption within a patched operating system function.

The Office Action concluded that Saito discloses using an operating system function "to replace words/text strings with different text". (See, the Office Action, p. 5, lines 15-16.) However, the cited function in Saito is not a patched operating system function. Rather, the cited function is a replacement function within text extraction system 3 (not the operating system) that executes via an "API hook" whenever the text extraction system 3 detects that the mouse's cursor remains in a substantially stationary position for an extended period of time. (See, e.g., Saito, col. 5, lines 46-67; col. 4, lines 45-49; col. 5, lines 34-36; col. 6, lines 31-33.) In other words, by employing the "API hook", Saito's system modifies the address of particular API calls to invoke non-operating system functions such as the functions associated with text input portion 31 and graphics drawing portion 32. (See, e.g., Saito, FIG. 1.)

The Office Action did not find that it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify Pomerantz in view of Saito in order to perform decryption within a patched operating system function. In this regard, the Office Action does not present a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the current claims. Additionally, for several reasons, it would not have been obvious to modify Pomerantz in view of Saito to perform decryption within a patched operating system function.

First, because neither Pomerantz nor Saito discloses a patched operating system function, the proposed combination of Pomerantz and Saito fails to include all of the claimed features. Second, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to modify Pomerantz as suggested because Pomerantz only performs decryption when user authentication is present. Hence, one skilled in the art would not have modified Pomerantz to automatically decrypt and display sensitive text when a user simply points the mouse cursor at the encrypted text as suggested by the Office Action.

Because neither Pomerantz nor Saito discloses decrypting encrypted text using a patched operating system function, and because it would not have been obvious to combine Pomerantz and Saito to produce this feature, the amended independent claims are all patentable over Pomerantz and Saito, taken individually or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the current rejections and allowance of the independent claims.

b. Dependent Claims 2-12, 14-18, 25, 27-37, 39-40, 42-43, 50, 52-58, 60, 62-63, 69-72, 73-79, 81, 83-84, 88-92, 116-123, and 125-132

The Office Action rejected each of the dependent claims based on Pomerantz and Saito, and, in some instances, one or more additional references. However, because each of the dependent claims depends from one of the patentable independent claims discussed above in section II(a), these dependent claims are all patentable over the proposed combinations of references for at least the reasons presented above in section II(a). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the current rejections and allowance of the dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned representative respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution might be advanced by discussing the application with the undersigned representative, in person or over the telephone, we welcome the opportunity to do so. In addition, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the same to Deposit Account 50-4402.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/19/2008
KING & SPALDING LLP
1700 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 626-8980

By: /Eric L. Sophir Reg. No. 48,499/
Eric L. Sophir
Registration No. 48,499